JULY
AUGUST
1969

WRL NEWS

Published by the War Resisters League 339 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y. 10012, U.S. branch of the War Resisters International, a pacifist organization with affiliates in 53 countries. Ralph DiGia, Administrative Secretary; David McReynolds, Field Secretary; Jim Peck, Editor.

No. 154

GROOVY GANDHI POSTER

Featuring a blowup of Ben Shahn's drawing of Gandhi (it appeared on the cover of the 1969 Peace Calendar) against a bright orange background, is Mark Morris' groovy poster announcing the War Resisters International's 13th Triennial Conference. At bottom is the name of the International in six languages. For poster collectors, it is a MUST.

The price is $2; $3 for day-glo

Proceeds will help pay the necessarily high travel cost of delegates from abroad.

The conference, this year of Gandhi's centennial, is the first to be held by WRI in the U.S. Aug. 25-31 at Haverford, Pa.

NAVY MAN WHO WILLED INSURANCE TO WRL FACES COURTMARTIAL

Roger Priest, the journalist seaman apprentice in the Navy who willed his service-connected life insurance to WRL, is now facing a possible courtmartial.

He has been charged with solicitation to desert the armed forces, disrespect toward superior commissioned officers, failure to obey a Navy regulation requiring a printed disclaimer in his servicemen's newsletter that the views expressed therein are not official Navy policy and publication of statements advising and urging insubordination by members of the military forces.

Commenting on the charges, Priest said: "By following the overkill routine they know so well, the admirals and generals are trying to silence dissension in the ranks by any means. This is the only way to view the heavy-handed attempts to put out of commission the anti-war, anti-military newsletter which I edit."

Legal defense for Priest is being prepared by David Rein, the attorney who handled the case of the Fort Jackson Eight. Public support is being mobilized by Serviceman's LINK to Peace, a Washington-based group supporting GI protestors. *In a note to WRL, Steve Wilcox of LINK says: "Hope you can help Roger Priest by asking WRL members to write Secretary of the Navy John Chaffee urging that the charges be dropped."*

Having apparently seen the story of Priest's action in last WRL NEWS, Frederich Staatz of Seattle wrote us recently: "Would you object to your becoming beneficiary to my GI insurance?" Priest, in publicly announcing his bequest to WRL, had called upon other GIs who "are committed to an end of the struggle in Vietnam," to do likewise.

WRL Is Alive & Well & Living in New York

—at the new peace center, 339 Lafayette Street. This is evidenced by the above photo by Bradford Lyttle. It is a sharp contract to the front page photos in last WRL NEWS, which showed the old WRL office after it had been vandalized on May 9.

David McReynolds is shown exhibiting the new poster for the forthcoming WRI triennial conference (see box at upper left). In addition to staff members, the photo shows a few of the many volunteer typists who made possible the reconstituting of the League's mailing list following theft of the files.

In terms of volunteer help, record-setting contributions and heartwarming expressions of support, the response to the May 9 raid would make even the most cynical feel that there is some hope for the human race.

"I just read your emergency issue (of WRL NEWS) posted on the humanities bulletin board here at MIT and was shocked," wrote Mrs. Leslie Robbins. "Of all targets to attempt to disperse, who on earth would be sufficiently demented to try to disrupt your activities and aims? I wish to enroll in your cause and receive your mailings."

Mrs. Robbins' letter was one of many from individuals who were not members before, but who joined, as Richard Winger of San Francisco expressed it: "to negate the work of the wreckers."

The response of the non-Establishment press also was encouraging. Such di-

(Continued on Back Page)

STAMP OUT WRI POVERTY

One way the WRI meets its budget is through the sale of stamps to collectors. Our own office has just gotten through shipping about ten *pounds* of stamps to London. (These are stamps that had piled up over the years as people sent them to our office instead of to London).

Please take note of the following instructions if you want to help "stamp out WRI poverty." First, save all foreign stamps on letters you receive. Second, save *only commemorative* U.S. stamps—regular issues are of no value. Third, do *not* soak off or tear off the stamps from the envelopes. Instead, tear off the corner of the envelope with the stamps on it. They will be properly soaked off in London. Fourth, do *not* send the stamps to our office. Please send them directly to Joyce Runham Brown at the War Resisters International, 3 Caledonian Rd., London N. 1, England. And save money by mailing the stamps by seamail rather than airmail and mail them only when you have a goodly packet.

Our thanks to those who have sent in their old stamp collections and who have so faithfully saved stamps over the years. It is impossible for Joyce in London to write each of you (without using up the profits from the sale of the stamps) and she has asked us, again, to let you know how much your help has been appreciated.

NEW LITERATURE

At last, the new literature list! (Excuse the lateness). Included in this mailing, it is far more extensive than the previous list, as you will see. Three pamphlets of interest subsequent to the list's publication are:

CADRE's excellent mini-prison anthology 25c
A CRITIQUE OF THE SAFEGUARD ABM, by Allan Forbes, Jr. 25c
WRI's pamphlet on AMERICAN DESERTERS 60c

AMNESTY PACKET

A literature packet on amnesty, containing 17 articles and statements on efforts to free war resisters in prison, in exile, under indictment, is now available for $1. Proceeds go to WRL. But orders should be sent NOT to the WRL office, but to Alfred E. Kuenzli, 512 N. Main Street, Edwardsville, Ill. 62025

A Peacemaker Orientation Program in Nonviolence will be held August 16-31 at Camp Fellowship, Bryson City, North Carolina. For further information, write George Lear, Jr., 520 E. Buffalo St., Ithaca, N.Y. 14850. A 3-day Training for Nonviolence will take place Aug. 1-3 at the Catholic Worker Farm, Tivoli, New York.

AMMON HENNACY . . .

. . . recipient of the 1969 WRL annual peace award, has picketed, fasted, been arrested for peace demonstrations more than any individual in the pacifist movement. His record exceeds even that of your editor. The full story can't be told here—it takes a whole book, "The Book of Ammon," his autobiography. Presently it is out of print but as soon as it is reprinted (within a few months), it again will be available from the WRL office. This photo was taken by Bradford Lyttle at The League's recent summer conference in Andover, New Jersey. The award will be presented at the forthcoming WRI conference.

ASHTON JONES' BOOK

"All court cases against me having been settled, my wife and I decided to celebrate by taking a long-dreamed-of vacation to the Great Northwest, Canada and Alaska," writes Rev. Ashton Jones, longtime lone crusader for peace and brotherhood, in the opening chapter of his book, "After Prison What?"

The book is a diary of that "vacation," which turns out to be, like so many of Ashton's Peace Car trips, interspersed with peace propagandizing and challenging civil liberties violations. And the trip ultimately is extended to traverse the entire U.S.

The 160-page paperback book concludes with a 25-page supplement on the Dykes Simmons, Jr. murder case which Ashton views as a clearcut frameup and in which he interceded on Simmons' behalf despite the latter's objection.

In line with the policy stated at the book's end that "any profit . . . will be given to the cause of world brotherhood through the different organizations which have encouraged me in my work," half the proceeds on copies sold by WRL will go to the League. Price of the book—89c. Order from WRL.

INTERNATIONAL PACIFIST PUBLICATIONS

As the Triennial approaches, pacifists may want to take a special look at those publications from abroad that are of interest to American pacifists.

There is, of course, *Peace News*, with which most WRL members are already familiar. This is the international pacifist weekly published in London, of exceptional quality and value. Sample copies can be had by writing the North American office, 160 N. 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., 19102.

Not as familiar to WRL members as it should be is *War Resistance*, the quarterly publication of the War Resisters International. The latest issue (28 pages) was devoted entirely to the question of American deserters. Roy Kepler of the United States is one of the three special corresponding editors. This quarterly should not only be in every serious college library, but also in the hands of all local peace groups. For just $2 a year you can get *War Resistance* sent directly from the international office. Subscribe by writing to: WRI, 3 Caledonian Road, London N. 1, England.

Meriting a wider audience packed with information, and invaluable for peace researchers, local peace groups, and college libraries, is *Peace Press*, a neatly mimeographed bulletin coming out once a month from the International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace. This should be ordered from the ICDP, 6 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C. 1, England. A year's airmail subscription is $5, seamail is $2.50. (ICDP also publishes two other special bulletins, one on Vietnam and one on Czechoslovakia—ask for sample copies of these when you subscribe to Peace Press.)

Finally, just to the North of us and in many ways serving as the theoretical quarterly for all of North America, is *Our Generation*, $1.25 an issue, and available from our own office at 339 Lafayette St., NYC 10012. Contributors to the most recent issue included Herbert Marcuse, David Horowitz, Martin Oppenheimer, Evan Stark, Hal Draper and others equally well known. WRL member George Benello is one of the editors, and Dimitri Roussopoulos, Canadian pacifist, radical and intellectual known to many of us, is the editor-in-chief.

On July 6 New England CNVA dedicated the A. J. Muste Center, a new building constructed by volunteers on the group's Voluntown, Conn. farm.

Gandhi as a Political Philosopher

By Henry Bass

Gandhi is not usually thought of as a political philosopher. This is largely because his political philosophy is so unusual. Most political philosophers—Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Augustine, Montesquieu, Locke, the Utopian Socialists, and Hegel, for example—were concerned with describing what they considered the ideal state or constitution or, if they were more realistic, the best practical state or constitution. Gandhi never got into that bag. He wrote relatively little on his conception of a good state or society, and what he did write is contradictory and indecisive.

Gandhi's political philosophy, rather than telling us much about the society that should be our goal, tells us instead how we should go about getting there. Satyagraha, Gandhi's method for nonviolent social change, is consequently a philosophy not of the ideal society but of fundamental political action.

Gandhi's emphasis on means rather than ends in his political philosophy seems at first to raise a problem for pacifists. Pacifists have always been sceptical of those who believe in nonviolence as a "tactic." Tactical nonviolence seems to mean that sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't. This, however, is not what Gandhi meant by his emphasis on means. In fact, Gandhi was well aware that it was precisely those who have their heads in some idealistic cloud thinking about ultimate ends who can most easily advocate violent means. And it is those whose ethics are down to earth and who are concerned with the here-and-now who are most likely to see that nonviolence is more than a tactic. Equally they see that it is not just an abstract ideal.

Gandhi did come to believe that nonviolence was more than a tactic by closing his eyes when it did not look as if it was working and saying that it was right anyway. He was not, as some of his followers seem to me inflexible and dogmatic, though his extreme asceticism obscures this. He would never have asked anyone to accept nonviolence on pure faith, as theologians once asked people to accept transsubstantiation. His belief that it is better to resist evil violently than to shrink cowardly from resisting evil at all would have prevented this.

Means and Ends

On the basis of his personal experience with revolutionary social change in-the-making he came to have a commitment to nonviolence that was firmer than any based on an intellectual consideration of historical examples could be and firmer than any based on a purely abstract faith could be. In fact Gandhi came to see a very simple but powerful truth from these observations. Specifically, he found that you cannot separate means and ends. The means you use *are* the ends you will get. Or, as A.J., quoting the anonymous French resister, used to say, "There is no way to peace; peace is the way." Gandhi saw very clearly the falseness of the assumption of those who make wars out of the belief that this can bring a peaceful world. He saw that the true revolutionist must lead a life in accord with what he seeks to bring about. He saw that you are as unlikely to achieve a nonviolent world through violence as you are to achieve socialism by becoming a drug monopolist so you can amass a fortune to give to the cause.

All over the world today people long for revolutionary change. Gandhi holds out the hope that this can be accomplished without atomic war on a global scale and without cops and students or blacks and whites shooting it out on a local level. Of course, satyagrahists can get maced, clubbed, and even killed as long as other people believe in violence. In the short run the failure of satyagrahists to use violent self-defense can even result in the loss of thousands of lives. But Gandhi strongly felt that satyagraha "results in the long run in the least loss of life and, what is more, it ennobles those who lose their lives and morally enriches the world for their sacrifice."

Gandhi also presents a method of social change that is more creative, dynamic and radical than violent revolution. Violent revolution, it seems to me, can be implemented only through a centralized leadership in control of disciplined cadres. In violent revolution leaders make assumptions about what is good for people, how others should be radicalized, and how history will absolve them from anything they feel called upon to do. The goal of violent revolution is normally the surrender of one's opponents without distinction among them. After victory a victorious elite usually imposes its will not only on the people losing but on its own comrades and allies as well. This has been shown over and over again from Stalin's blood purges to Castro's jailing of his former comrades-in-revolution in Cuba.

The Advantages of Nonviolence

Satyagraha often seems to proceed more slowly than violent revolution. This is because with satyagraha you attempt to transform your opponents integrating them into the new society you seek and because you too may be changed in the process. This takes time. For example, Cesar Chavez said that the farm workers could have won the grape strike long ago if they had resorted to violence but that it would have been a hollow victory since it would not have led the growers to have the respect for the union that is necessary for fruitful long range collective bargaining.

Lots of people say we can't wait for peace and freedom for niceties like this. They say we have to have them NOW regardless. However, if wishes were horses, "now" would have been years ago. And Gandhi was quite optimistic about the rapidness of satyagraha, saying: "In reality there is no force in the world that is so swift in working."

Gandhi's minute analysis of the process of social change and conflict gave him a subtler and richer philosophy of political change than Che's. Few people, Che included, prefer violence to nonviolence on ethical grounds. Gandhi was not particularly original in seeing that love is more ethical than the sword. For thousands and thousands of years practically all philosophers and religionists have been saying this. Gandhi's contribution lies not in repeating the platitude but in making nonviolence into a far more practical means for revolutionary social change. He showed us more convincingly than pacifists in the past had ever been able to that one could really live nonviolently and not just believe in nonviolence as something that sometime worked but which was usually appropriate only for saints and cranks.

Satyagraha is a more fully human method of social change than violent revolution. It is also less likely to blow the world to bits. And it is more radical in the change it brings about and the participation it allows of those involved in the struggle. Consequently, if the world survives long enough, in the long run satyagraha is far more potent than violent revolution. In fact, we may some day look back on Gandhi's invention of satyagraha as being as important and revolutionary in the social and moral sphere as the invention of the steam engine was in the technical and economic sphere.

Gandhi, Lenin, and Revolution Today

By Bob Eaton

In motivation, human concern and willingness for personal sacrifice Gandhi and Lenin were very similar. Both in their last days were disappointed men. Though probably unable to judge the magnitude of the horror, Lenin saw the slow rise of Stalin. Gandhi died as Hindu and Moslem fought one another and his party followers left him to take positions of state power. Both leaders saw the revolutionary vision of their followers cloud over with the pursuit of power and consolidation of partial gains.

One important area where these men parted ways in their search for a just social order was in their view of state oppression. While differences of history and method existed, the British in India and the Czars in Russia oppressed the vast majority of the people. Gandhi and Lenin were sophisticated enough to avoid the conclusion that it was a question of personalities in government. Each studied the system of oppression which was at work and which operated independently of individual men in power. Thus, each was a radical. Their understanding of oppression led them in different directions. For our purposes a simplified view of Lenin's analysis was that the state oppressed because it was the outgrowth of the primary determinant of exploitation-the relation of man to the means of production. The root problem was economic and the increasing internal contradictions of pre-socialist societies would bring into being the forces that would humanize these relationships.

The Indian Situation

Gandhi clearly recognized the economic dimension to India's colonial status and oppression. The spinning wheel for him was not an aesthetic's metaphor but a real instrument of breaking the economic bonds of British imperialism in the area of textiles. But as early as 1908 he saw that, "the English have not taken India; we have given it to them. They are not in India because of their strength but because we keep them." In other words, oppression is a two way street—it takes the cooperation of both oppressor and oppressed. For Gandhi, the struggle against oppression must not only involve an end of economic exploitation but an end to the mentality that accepts and collaborates with state oppression. This explains Gandhi's major concern with untouchability and Moslem-Hindu fighting. Both were signs of Indian willingness to oppress and be oppressed.

Freedom from the English would be empty from a revolutionary point of view without freedom from the mentality which allows a people to exploit each other and to be exploited. The quality of the revolutionary struggle in India during its most active phases of 1920-22 and 1930-34 was more important than the possibility of seizing power. Mass activity was probably great enough in the early 20's to launch a violent struggle to overthrow British rule. States have been overthrown with far less mass activity. Yet, Gandhi called off his campaign in 1922. The system to be overthrown involved more than British imperialism in India. Gandhi said in 1927, "I would use the most deadly weapons if I believed they would destroy the system . . . I refrain only because the use of such weapons would only perpetuate the system, though it may destroy its present administrators."

If the "revolution" did not revolutionize its participants then it was meaningless. It would be nothing more than "coup'ism." Gandhi sought the most fundamental (and the most difficult) revolution of all. Rather than shift exploitation from one class to another, or from one race to another, or from one nation to another, he sought to eliminate the term exploitation from the human vocabulary.

Lenin and Marxists since him have attempted to eliminate exploitation from a position of state power. Gandhi saw a revolutionary necessity for everyone at the grass roots to develop the consciousness to resist the roles of oppressor or oppressed. This was not something that could be directed from above. This did not blind him to British imperialism or English resistance to Indian independence, "England will never make any real advance so as to satisfy India's aspirations till she is forced to it. British rule is no philanthropic job, it is a terribly earnest business proposition worked out from day to day with deadly precision. The coating of benevolence that is periodically given to it merely prolongs the agony."

Gandhi saw the revolutionary struggle as one principally of education and self discipline of the masses. His strategy was to renounce arms and violence. Thus, while he was clearly a "leader," his faith was incredibly egalitarian and populist. Violence is the weapon of an elite preserving a status quo or the weapons of a vanguard seeking to change it. Nonviolence is a weapon that ultimately relies upon the general mass of people. Its very logic is to demand complete and democratic revolution. Without such a revolution elitist violence will continually plague society. Political freedom was, in his opinion, dependent upon the social and economic regeneration of the country; this regeneration had to come through the efforts of the people themselves. "The fact is," he had written, "that political emancipation means a rise of mass-consciousness. It cannot come without affecting all the branches of national activity."

A Never-Ending Revolution

Gandhi, as Lenin, saw the need for a complete revolution and not just a shift of political power. Lenin went on to considerations of the economic dimension to power and Gandhi went further yet by perceiving the absolute necessity for the revolutionary process to first become a part of the masses very being.

This is the type of revolution that will probably never end. Its goal is not victory of one class or race over another but liberation from exploitation. It is not obsessed with seizing power but rather with creating power—power to resist oppression and renounce arms. The Gandhian insight on the nature of oppression provides a valuable guide for Americans. We must deal with the total system of human exploitation in all its dimensions. In a nuclear age which also puts incredible non-nuclear violence at the disposal of the state for domestic use, we must shift the ground of revolutionary conflict. Violent revolution in America would invite World War 3 and would not address itself to the problems of an oppressive and basically affluent society. Nonviolence promises the hope of disarming (unilaterally if necessary) our nuclear threat to the world and the building of democratic form of power to resist domestic and foreign oppression. There's no guarantee that the forces of increasing regimentation and bureaucracy can be turned back and man liberated. The problem is deeper than economic relationships. Ultimately man's ability to extricate himself will lie in his ability to break through the system of violent exploitation. By necessity that will have to be a nonviolent and democratic process. Gandhi might not recognize the forms such a process will take but his basic insight still holds true.

"I would use the most deadly weapons, if I believed they would destroy the system . . . I refrain only because they would perpetrate it."

TOWARD A WORLD WITHOUT WAR

By Otto Nathan

A quarter of a century ago, at the end of World War II some of us hoped that the savagery of those terrible six years would have taught mankind a lesson and that early steps would be taken leading eventually to the elimination of violence and war. It was felt that the threat to the world of total annihilation created by the barbarous weapons shamefully used by the United States over Japan would strengthen and accelerate the efforts to make a real beginning toward a saner and more decent world.

These hopes have failed. There is no need to enumerate all the evils and injustices, the wars, violence, suffering and brutalities that abound in our own country and throughout the world. The question must be asked whether we have done enough to help change the course toward total destruction upon which mankind seems to be engaged. That question must be asked not to indict us and others for failures in the past but to gain a clearer vision for action in the future.

We are concerned here only with ourselves—the WRL and the WRI—both of which, at the forthcoming Triennial Conference of the International will have an opportunity to assess past years activities and to chart a course for the years ahead.

Those who belong to, and believe in, the war resistance movement will continue advocating a nonviolent approach in all matters of domestic and international concern; they will offer and promote noncooperation, resistance and opposition to all action, that may lead to violence as well as to violence and wars themselves. They will also increase their efforts to remove the causes of war: they will fight nationalism, racism, human exploitation and oppression as well as inequality of any type human beings and among nations. But they will have to recognize that these activities will not suffice if their prime objective, the abolition of violence and war, is to be accomplished before other Vietnams, Hiroshimas and Nagasakis may occur.

Universal Disarmament

I suggest that war can be eliminated only if it is made physically impossible for the nations of the world to wage war, if national armies and armaments are universally abolished and if an international machinery is created to settle peacefully disputes and conflicts that may rise between individual nations. I suggest that WRL and WRI adopt active promotion of universal disarmament as one of their major planks.

This suggestion in no way conflicts with the pacifist idea of unilateral disarmament which members of the League and the International have advocated for years. Their goal has always been universal abolition of violence and war, their hope has been that unilateral disarmament may lead the way to universality. Mulford Sibley once said that if a general disarmament agreement could not be reached in the immediate future, it would be desirable and realistic to adopt a policy of unilateral disarmament. I feel inclined to reverse this statement. Given the political realities in the United States, considering that vast efforts over a period of five years have not succeeded to make those who wield political power in this country terminate the immoral, brutal, barbarous and criminal war in Vietnam, I cannot believe that unilateral disarmament has any chance in the reasonably near future. This is one of the reasons why I feel that the pacifist movement, loyal to its basic, philosophical convictions, should support universal disarmament.

I make this suggestion without any illusion about the enormous difficulties that have to be overcome if the world is to be disarmed. I realize that many countries will claim that disarmament, supranationally decreed and enforced, impairs their sovereignity which they jealously want to guard. I do not ignore for one moment that the anti-revolutionary posture of the United States and the "Free World" will prove a huge obstacle to any attempt of dismantling national armies. Hardly less fierce resistance to disarmament will be offered by nations which either have gone through revolutions and are anxious to protect and deepen fundamental changes in society, or which hope to gain freedom from external rulers through revolutionary upheavals. I feel, however, that the need for abolition of war, has become so compelling even to the rulers of the various countries, that the assurance of simultaneity and universality may prove an asset in overcoming the tremendous barriers which block the road to a warless world.

The dream of a world without war is old. However, the promotion of universal disarmament has been greatly intensified in the last few decades by the erstwhile inconceivable destructiveness of modern mechanical, nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons and their threat to the survival of all living matter.

In promoting universal disarmament, the League, the International and other organizations with the same philosophical outlook will have a special contribution to make. They have advocated the abolition of violence and war long before the modern terror and mass destruction weapons were developed. They have opposed wars with a deep moral commitment, believing in the absolute value of human life and convinced that there can never be any defense, on whatever basis, for deliberate and organized killing of human beings. This is a quality which they must bring to the struggle for general and universal disarmament.

Pacifists Must Support It

If the League and the International decide to add universal disarmament specifically to their program, large-scale educational promotion of that goal is urgently needed. The specifics cannot be spelled out here. Ever since the end of World War 2, universal disarmament has been given considerable attention by individual scholars and by many organizations. A great step forward appeared to have been made when the General Assembly of the United Nations, at its 1959 session, adopted a unanimous resolution describing "general and complete disarmament" as the most important question facing the world. Moreover, as a result of that resolution and subsequent discussions in the United Nations, the United States and the Soviet Union submitted on September 16, 1961, a very promising "Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations." The Joint Statement called for an international agreement which would ensure that "disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems." The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament which, as a consequence of the Joint Statement, was set up by the United Nations in Geneva, paved the way for the 1963 Test Ban Treaty and the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty. Except for discussion of some special aspects of the issue, little progress has been made toward an agreement on general disarmament. This is due not only to the enormous difficulties inherent in the problem, but possibly even more to the fact that the international atmosphere has been poisoned by the war in Vietnam in which the two superpowers, on whom so much depends, are involved.

The need for progress toward the abolition of violence and war is hence just one more reason why the United States should forthwith declare a cease fire in Vietnam and should bring all American troops, home now.

A NONCONFERENCE ON NONVIOLENCE

By Randy Kehler

The objective of our "Nonconference Conference" in Berkeley May 11 was to present nonviolence as something really alive, vibrant, relevant to the contemporary scene—*not* as something naive, esoteric, out-dated, and irrelevant (which altogether too many people think it is).

How can I describe it? Really, Bill Gonda's photographs do the job better than any words can. It was joyous. It was quiet. It was serious. It was fun. It was together. A picnic, a fair, an exhibition, a be-in.

It was Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi. It was making bread and throwing pots. It was the grape strike and it was tax refusal. It was resistance; it was nonregistration. It was "Kiss Gandhi's Nose" and make your own jug band music. It was combat photos from Vietnam. It was free literature and free, "nonviolent" (macrobiotic) food. It was the Ecological Revolution. It was the Nonviolent Revolution. It was talking and smiling and laughing and singing and hugging and dancing. It was the Vietnamese Buddhists and the Czechoslavakian resistance. It was spinning and weaving and making your own god's-eye.

I think our experiment was a success. The seventy or so people who added their names to our mailing list were unanimous in their approval and all urged us to do it again soon, perhaps in the street the next time. Now, it seems, we must further develop this new form, add new elements to it, make the relationship of the parts to the whole even more clear, and, most of all, communicate it to the world.

WRL IS ALIVE (continued)

verse publications as the Militant, Guardian, New America and Village Voice—to name just a handful—publicized the raid and thus helped alert WRLers to send in their names and addresses for the reconstituted mailing list.

We want to take this opportunity to express our heartfelt thanks to those who responded in our moment of need—from the surprising number of individuals who sent in over $100 to the many individuals who took the trouble to send in their names and addresses (in some cases with a note that they simply could not afford to give anything now but would do so in the future.)

A number of individuals, in their letters, contrasted—or compared—the WRL raid to the raids on draft boards which have occurred in Baltimore, Catonsville, Washington, Milwaukee, Chicago and, most recently, New York. Apparently there is a sharp division within the pacifist movement as to the validity of raids on draft boards as a protest technique. Some feel that it is justifiable in light of the outrageousness of the Vietnam war. Others feel that it is unjustifiable, ethically, under any conditions. A full discussion of the issue will appear in next WRL NEWS.

WRL JOINS SPONSORSHIP OF D.C. PROTEST

WRL, along with Catholic Peace Fellowship, Episcopal Peace Fellowship and Philadelphia Resistance, has joined in co-sponsoring the weekly readings of war dead names initiated in May by a Quaker Action Group.

They take place Wednesdays at the Capitol (meet at 9 a.m., 245 Second Street NE) and Thursdays at the Pentagon (meet same time, same place). On Wednesdays prior to June 25, when the courts finally recognized the right to protest on the east steps of the Capitol, there were a total of 87 arrests. Ed and Connie Sohodski, leaders of the northern Delaware WRL group were arrested June 18.

The war dead reading at the Pentagon started July 10. Those who read the names outside the building were not molested but six who read the names in the shopping concourse were arrested.

CHARGE WRL "INDUCED" DESERTIONS

In testimony released June 20 by the House Appropriations Committee, the Defense Department listed 21 groups in eight countries which actively "induced" desertions from American military units. The only U.S. organization named was WRL. (A pamphlet entitled "The American Deserter" was published recently by WRI in London.) The League presently is trying to get the full transcript of the testimony.

The day before the big march supporting the People's Park in Berkeley, WRL West conducted nonviolent training sessions at LeConte School attended by over 1000 persons.

* * *

The Atlanta Workshop in Nonviolence was evicted in June—the fourth eviction in a little over two years. This time the pretext was the lack of a fire escape to the second floor. The eviction came only a few days after a raid by police with a search warrant—not for the Workshop—but for a print shop.

ENROLLMENT BLANK

Send to War Resisters League
339 Lafayette Street, N. Y., N.Y. 10012

WAR IS A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY. I THEREFORE AM DETERMINED NOT TO SUPPORT ANY KIND OF WAR, INTERNATIONAL OR CIVIL, AND TO STRIVE FOR THE REMOVAL OF ALL THE CAUSES OF WAR

signature _____

address _____

city _____ *state* _____

occupation _____ *age* _____